

Date of Hearing: June 26, 2024

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Al Muratsuchi, Chair
SB 445 (Portantino) – As Amended June 13, 2024

SENATE VOTE: 40-0

SUBJECT: Special education: individualized education programs: guidance for translation services

SUMMARY: Requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to develop and issue guidance advising local educational agencies (LEAs) on best practices in translating a pupil's individualized education program (IEP) documents into the native language of a Limited English Proficient (LEP) parent, and requires the CDE to translate the statewide IEP template currently under development into the top 10 most commonly spoken languages used across the state other than English and make those templates available on its website. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires the CDE to, no later than July 1, 2025, develop and issue guidance advising LEAs on best practices in translating a pupil's IEP and written documents into the native language of a LEP parent.
- 2) Requires the CDE, in developing the guidance, to:
 - a) Ensure the guidance on written translation is consistent with federal law, including, but not limited to, the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the federal Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 (EEOA);
 - b) Review local plans submitted by special education local plan areas (SELPAs), specifically for existing guidance on the translation of IEP documents;
 - c) Consult with relevant stakeholders, including, but not limited to, administrators, special education teachers, and LEP parents whose children have IEPs; and
 - d) No later than April 1, 2025, convene a workgroup to review and provide input on the guidance as it is being developed that includes, but is not limited to, all of the following relevant special education advocacy organizations:
 - i) Disability Rights California;
 - ii) Innovate Public Schools; and
 - iii) Educate. Advocate.
- 3) Requires that the guidance include all of the following:
 - a) Information that explains the responsibility of an LEA to, pursuant to specified state and federal law and regulations, provide written translated copies of certain IEP documents into the native language of an LEP parent of a pupil with exceptional needs, at no cost to the LEP parent;

- b) A recommendation to, upon a LEP parent's request, translate the following documents within 30 calendar days of the IEP team meeting, or within 30 calendar days of a later request by the LEP parent, into the native language of the LEP parent, or into another mode of communication used by the LEP parent, such as an agreed upon preferred language specified by the LEP parent:
- i) The pupil's drafted IEP before the IEP team meeting;
 - ii) The pupil's completed IEP and any revisions to the pupil's IEP;
 - iii) Documents required to be translated pursuant to specified regulations;
 - iv) Any evaluation, assessment, progress data, or other document used to determine eligibility or to develop the IEP that is discussed at an IEP team meeting; and
 - v) Other vital written materials associated with an IEP, including, but not limited to, parent notification of an IEP meeting, parent notification of IEP meeting recommendations, notice of procedural safeguards for parents of pupils with disabilities, parent consent for initial evaluation, parent consent for reevaluation, evaluation reports, eligibility determination, manifestation determination review documents, IEP progress reports, prior written notice, and Medicaid consent forms.
- c) A recommendation to notify parents, in writing, before each IEP meeting, of their right to request the translation of specified IEP documents, how to request translated documents, and whom to contact if the parent has questions or complaints about the translated documents. Requires the written notice to encouraged to be provided in English, common languages, and in the parent's preferred language, if known and practicable;
- d) A recommendation for the use of qualified translators, regardless of whether the individual is an employee of the LEA or is an outside vendor or contractor, and the recommended criteria for meeting the definition of a qualified translator, including, at a minimum, that a qualified translator meets all of the following criteria:
- i) Is proficient and literate in English and the non-English language to be used;
 - ii) Has the ability to communicate terms and ideas between the English language and the non-English language to be used, considering regional language variations;
 - iii) Has knowledge of basic translator practices, including, but not limited to, privacy, neutrality, accuracy, completeness, and transparency; and
 - iv) Has undergone sufficient professional training to adequately utilize and translate special education terminology.
- e) A recommended process that LEAs can follow to find qualified vendors for translating services, including any certifications that may signify the vendor has qualified translators;
- f) A recommendation that if an LEA provides an interim computer-generated translated IEP document, it should not extend the recommended timeline for completing an official translation by a qualified translator;

- g) A recommendation that LEAs track data related to the need for translation services during the IEP process, including, but not limited to, all of the following:
 - i) The total number of IEPs involving pupils with LEP parents, disaggregated by language;
 - ii) The total number of translation requests from LEP parents for IEPs and related documents, disaggregated by language; and
 - iii) The total number of translations of IEPs and related documents completed annually, disaggregated by language.
- 4) Requires the CDE to post the guidance as an informational resource page on its website, review and, if necessary, update, the information on the resource page, as often as needed, but at a minimum every two years, and notify LEAs and other relevant stakeholders when an update is made.
- 5) Requires the CDE, no later than six months after the forthcoming statewide IEP template is developed by the California Collaborative for Excellence in Education (CCEE), translate the template into the top 10 most commonly spoken languages used across the state other than English and make those templates available on its website.
- 6) Requires the CDE to notify LEAs and other relevant stakeholders that the IEP template, including all translated templates, are available on its internet website and via other methods of dissemination upon request.
- 7) Establishes the following definitions for purposes of the act:
 - a) “Limited English Proficient” or “LEP” means an individual who is limited in their English proficiency on account of their national origin, including, but not limited to, their ancestry, foreign birth, or home languages other than English;
 - b) “Local educational agency” means a school district, county office of education (COE), or charter school.
 - c) “Native language” has the same meaning as specified in federal regulations.
 - d) “Parent” has the same meaning as defined in specified state law;
 - e) “Vital written materials” means, pursuant to the Statement of Interest filed by the United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) and the United States Department of Education (USDOE) on June 4, 2016, a pupil’s IEP, other documents related to the pupil’s IEP, and the pupil’s regular education program.
- 8) States that nothing in the act is intended to affect any other state or federal law requirement regarding the translation of education-related documents, including, but not limited to, the right to alternative communication services in existing law.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Requires LEAs to take any action necessary to ensure that, in an IEP team meeting, the parent or guardian understands the proceeding, including arranging for an interpreter for parents or guardians with deafness or whose native language is a language other than English. (Education Code (EC) 56341.5)
- 2) Requires proposed special education assessment plans to be provided to parents in the native language of the parent or other mode of communication used by the parent, unless it is clearly not feasible to do so. (EC 56321)
- 3) Requires LEAs to give the parent or guardian a copy of the IEP, at no cost to the parent or guardian. (EC 56341.5)
- 4) Requires, through regulations, LEAs to give a parent or guardian a copy of a student's IEP in his or her primary language at his or her request. (California Code of Regulations (CCR), 3040)
- 5) Provides that it is a due process right for parents to receive written notice of his or her rights in a language easily understood by the general public and in the native language of the parent, or other mode of communication used by the parent, unless to do so is clearly not feasible. (EC 56506)
- 6) Defines "consent" in special education proceedings to include situations in which the parent or guardian has been fully informed of all information relevant to the activity for which consent is sought, in his or her native language, or other mode of communication. (EC 56021.1)
- 7) Requires schools and school districts, if 15% or more of the students enrolled in a public school speak a single primary language other than English, to send all notices, reports, statements, or records to the parent or guardian in the primary language, in addition to English. Existing law authorizes the response from the parent or guardian to be in English or their primary language. (EC 48985)
- 8) Provides that no person in the State of California shall, on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, ethnic group identification, age, mental disability, physical disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, or sexual orientation, be unlawfully denied full and equal access to the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity that is conducted, operated, or administered by the state or by any state agency, is funded directly by the state, or receives any financial assistance from the state. (Government Code (GOV) 11135)
- 9) Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits recipients of federal financial assistance, including school districts, from discriminating on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Title VI's prohibition on national origin discrimination requires school districts to take "affirmative steps" to address language barriers so that English learners may participate meaningfully in schools' educational programs.

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill. The author states, “SB 445 ensures that parents will be able to read and comprehend their children’s IEP to better be involved in their child’s academic life. Language barriers for parents are a hurdle that can and should be overcome. Parental engagement early in a child’s academic life is critical to helping districts provide necessary services for students to reach their potential and achieve success.”

History of compliance issues around interpretation and translation in special education proceedings. A 2015 joint letter from the USDOE and the USDOJ highlighted a number of compliance problems related to English learners and rights established under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The departments noted a history of compliance problems around “fail[ure] to provide translation or an interpreter at IEP meetings.”

Research provided by the author’s office also identifies these concerns, pointing to cultural and institutional barriers preventing parents with limited English proficiency from understanding and participating fully in special education processes (Harry, 1992; Zetlin, 1996), including barriers to receiving translated copies of IEPs (Beebe, 2016).

Translation timeline and scope. This bill would require the CDE to issue guidance recommending that, upon a LEP parent’s request, an LEA translate the specified documents within 30 calendar days of the IEP team meeting, or within 30 calendar days of a later request by the LEP parent, into the native language of the LEP parent.

Current state and federal law require that school districts take any action necessary to ensure that parents understand the proceedings at an IEP meeting. Current state regulations further require LEAs to give parents a copy of a student’s IEP in his or her primary language at his or her request. No timeframe is specified. Some LEAs currently meet the 30 day timeline for IEP translation. The Los Angeles Unified School District is required to translate IEPs, but not related documents, pursuant to a modified consent decree as a result of a lawsuit.

The documents which would need to be translated within 30 days are:

- The pupil’s drafted IEP before the IEP team meeting;
- The pupil’s completed IEP and any revisions to the pupil’s IEP;
- Documents required to be translated pursuant to specified regulations;
- Any evaluation, assessment, progress data, or other document used to determine eligibility or to develop the IEP that is discussed at an IEP team meeting; and
- Other vital written materials associated with an IEP, including, but not limited to, parent notification of an IEP meeting, parent notification of IEP meeting recommendations, notice of procedural safeguards for parents of pupils with disabilities, parent consent for initial evaluation, parent consent for reevaluation, evaluation reports, eligibility determination, manifestation determination review documents, IEP progress reports, prior written notice, and Medicaid consent forms.

Federal guidance on translation of “vital written material.” This bill requires the translation of vital written materials, defined to mean documents related to the pupil’s IEP and the pupil’s regular education program, as specified in the Statement of Interest (SOI) filed by the USDOJ and the USDOE on June 4, 2016, a pupil’s IEP.

The bill specifies that vital written materials includes those associated with an IEP, including parent notification of an IEP meeting, parent notification of IEP meeting recommendations, notice of procedural safeguards, parent consent for initial evaluation, parent consent for reevaluation, evaluation reports, eligibility determination, manifestation determination review documents, IEP progress reports, prior written notice, and Medicaid consent forms.

The 2016 SOI referenced in the bill is summarized in an accompanying “Dear Colleague” letter. This letter clarifies that state educational agencies and school districts have independent responsibilities (apart from those in the IDEA) to provide LEP parents of children with disabilities meaningful access through timely and complete translation and oral interpretation under the under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI) and the EEOA. It states:

Whether a document is “vital written material” depends upon the importance of the program, information, encounter, or service involved, and the consequence to the LEP person if the information in question is not provided accurately or in a timely manner. Accordingly, in the SOI, the United States declares that a student’s IEP is vital, and that other documents related to a student’s special education program, as well as their regular education program, will also often meet these criteria because they will be vital to parents understanding their children’s education placement, progress, and recommendations from the district.

Under Title VI, all vital documents, including a student’s IEP, must be accessible to LEP parents, but that does not necessarily mean that all vital documents must be translated for every language in the district. For example, a timely and complete oral interpretation or translated summary of a vital document might suffice in some circumstances. A district must, however, be prepared to provide timely and complete translated IEPs to provide meaningful access to the IEP and the parental rights that attach to it. This is because a parent needs meaningful access to the IEP not just during the IEP meeting, but also across school years to monitor the child’s progress and ensure that IEP services are provided. Additionally, in the SOI, the United States also explains that the EEOA requires state educational agencies and school districts to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers of LEP parents and that “appropriate action” includes translations and oral interpretations for LEP parents.

English learners significantly overrepresented in special education. Also according to the CDE, about 14.4% of California’s ELs qualify for special education, compared to 9.1% of non-ELs. According to data provided by the CDE for the 2014-15 academic year, students with disabilities who are ELs are significantly overrepresented in the higher grades, as shown in the table below:

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ELs in Special Education	6.3%	7.7%	8.6%	10.3%	14.3%	17.4%	21.5%	23.0%	23.9%	21.1%	22.4%	22.7%	26.2%
Non-ELs in Special Education	6.4%	7.9%	9.0%	9.9%	10.3%	10.3%	9.5%	9.1%	9.1%	8.4%	8.7%	8.5%	9.9%

California also has an above average percentage of ELs in special education compared to other states. Data reported by the USDOE's Office of Civil Rights (OCR) indicate that in 2011-12 California identified 13.3% of ELs, compared to a national average rate of 11.9%. OCR data also show that California enrolls 35% of all ELs in special education in the country.

Pursuant to AB 2785 (O'Donnell) Chapter 579, Statutes of 2016, the CDE published a manual to provide guidance to LEAs on the identification, assessment, services, and reclassification for ELs with disabilities, with the goal of reducing the over and under representation of ELs with disabilities.

Other states with far fewer ELs have translated special education forms into multiple languages. California does not. This bill requires the CDE, no later than six months after the forthcoming statewide IEP template is developed by the CCEE, to translate the template into the top 10 most commonly spoken languages used across the state other than English and make those templates available on its website.

Translating special education documents would be easier for LEAs if they had access to standard forms already translated into commonly spoken languages.

Other state departments of education (including a number with a far smaller population of non-native English speakers) share such translated forms in various languages through their websites. As of 2015, these included:

- Massachusetts: all forms available in 16 languages
- Minnesota: several forms available in 10 languages
- Oregon: standard IEP form available in 4 languages
- Washington: all forms available 7 languages
- Iowa: standard IEP form in 6 languages
- New York: all forms available in 5 languages
- Colorado, Rhode Island, Illinois, Utah, Texas: forms available in 1-3 languages

California, which has the largest population of ELs in the country, does not maintain such translated forms (apart from the notice of procedural safeguards, which is translated into five languages). Such a resource would make it easier for LEAs to meet the requirements of both this bill and of other provisions of state and federal law, and ensure that translations are of sufficient quality.

The CDE does not maintain these forms because the state does not publish standard special education forms. Many LEAs use forms that they either obtain from the Special Education Information System operated by the San Joaquin County Office of Education, or produce their own. Without standard forms, it is unlikely that there will be state-translated forms of those documents, as are provided in other states. As discussed below, the state is currently engaged in the development of a statewide standardized IEP template.

The CDE maintains a Clearinghouse for Multilingual Documents, an online resource that helps LEAs find pre-existing, locally-created translations of parental notification documents. This database of multilingual documents contains some documents that would inform IEP development, but according to the CDE, since this project is a Title III service (federal English

learner statute) and the IEP is not a Title III obligation, it does not include special education forms.

State standardized IEP template workgroup recommends translation of IEP template and other resources. As noted above, this bill requires the CDE, no later than six months after the forthcoming statewide IEP template is developed by the CCEE, translate the template into the top 10 most commonly spoken languages used across the state other than English and make those templates available on its website.

SB 74 (Committee on Budget), Chapter 51, Statutes of 2019, required the CDE to convene a workgroup to design a state standardized IEP template. The workgroup was comprised of representatives of the CDE, the Department of Rehabilitation (DOR), the Department of Developmental Services (DDS), LEAs, special education local plan areas (SELPAs), legislative staff, and relevant state and national policy experts.

The workgroup report, published in October 2021, made 25 recommendations to improve the IEP process in California and ensure that IEPs are designed to improve student outcomes, capture student needs, and inform learning strategies that support instruction that is aligned to state standards and provided in the general education setting whenever possible. The report noted:

In addition to addressing the power dynamics within the education system and between the education system and families, IEP teams must also navigate cultural differences. While many students with IEPs in California are culturally and linguistically diverse learners, very few special education teachers and administrators are from diverse cultures (Reiman, Beck, Coppola, & Englies, 2010). This imbalance often leads to a language and cultural barrier between culturally and linguistically diverse parents/guardians and school personnel (Lo, 2009; Reiman, Beck, Coppola, & Englies, 2010; Salas, 2004). Research on the role of Mexican American families (Salas, 2004), Chinese American families (Lo, 2008), and families from a range of other racial/ethnic groups (Fish, 2008; Garriott et al., 2000; Zeitlin & Curcic, 2013) all indicated that while parents/guardians frequently attend IEP meetings, they are often not provided the opportunity to make significant contributions to the content of their children's IEPs.

While difficult, overcoming the barriers to increased parent engagement is also manageable. Proven strategies for increasing parent engagement include making the meetings more democratic and not completing the IEP in advance so that parents feel they are equal contributors; being open to parental input regarding placement, discipline, and instruction; valuing and listening to parental input; and educating parents about the IEP process including by providing IEP forms in advance (Christle & Yell, 2010; Fish, 2006; Fish, 2008; Goldman & Burke, 2017; Platt, 2008; Simon, 2006).

With respect to translation of documents, the workgroup recommended that the state:

- Provide state-developed or state-funded resources and supports for families/guardians in at least the five most common languages spoken by California students, in as many languages as needed when possible, written in plain language, and using images to support comprehension; and

- Make the proposed IEP template available in the top five languages spoken by California families/guardians, including in the most needed languages for pilot sites.

The Budget Act of 2022 appropriated \$200,000 for the CCEE to convene a panel, comprised of members selected in consultation with and subject to the approval of the Executive Director of the State Board of Education (SBE), to continue refining the workgroup's draft IEP template for usability. On or before June 30, 2024, the CCEE is required to provide the Legislature and other parties an update on the development of a state standardized IEP template.

Automated translations of IEPs. Proponents of this measure have noted problems with the accuracy of translation of special education documents using automated translation services. Concerns have also been raised about the privacy of student information using these translation services. In a joint letter from the USDOE and the USDOJ dated January 7, 2015, the departments raised several issues with regard to the use of web-based translation of special education documents:

Some school districts have used web-based automated translation to translate documents. Utilization of such services is appropriate only if the translated document accurately conveys the meaning of the source document, including accurately translating technical vocabulary. The Departments caution against the use of web-based automated translations; translations that are inaccurate are inconsistent with the school district's obligation to communicate effectively with [limited English proficient] parents. Thus, to ensure that essential information has been accurately translated and conveys the meaning of the source document, the school district would need to have a machine translation reviewed, and edited as needed, by an individual qualified to do so. Additionally, the confidentiality of documents may be lost when documents are uploaded without sufficient controls to a web-based translation service and stored in their databases. School districts using any web-based automated translation services for documents containing personally identifiable information from a student's education record must ensure that disclosure to the web-based service complies with the requirements of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

How are parents informed of their rights to interpretation and translation? This bill requires that CDE to issue guidance recommending that 1) LEAs notify parents, in writing, before each IEP meeting, of their right to request the translation of specified IEP documents, and that 2) LEAs translate the Notice of Procedural Safeguards, which is required to be provided to parents, into the language of LEP parents.

The Notice of Procedural Safeguards explains all of the rights afforded to students and parents under IDEA and state law. The CDE provides a model Notice of Procedural Safeguards on their website, translated into four languages. Parents may also learn about their rights by consulting with one of the Family Empowerment Centers on Disability (FECs) established by state law to help parents navigate the special education process through peer support. Additionally, there are two types of federally-funded parent resources: Parent Training Information Centers and California Community Parent Resource Centers.

Recommended Committee amendments. Staff recommends that this bill be amended to:

- 1) Require that the guidance, where it exceeds the requirements of state or federal law, regulations, or guidance, be referred to as best practices, rather than recommendations.

- 2) Add a statement that the best practices identified in the guidance shall not be construed as mandates which exceed the requirements of state and federal law, regulations, and guidance.
- 3) Add to the definition and the list of vital written materials “to the extent that these documents are vital to parents understanding their children’s education placement, progress, and recommendations from the district.”
- 4) Require that SELPA plans be reviewed for existing practices, instead of guidance, on the translation of documents.
- 5) Remove the list of specific organizations from the workgroup, and instead require that the workgroup include 1) organizations representing LEP parents of pupils with IEPs; 2) organizations which protect and advocate for pupils with disabilities and their families; 3) representatives of local educational agencies, including teachers of pupils with IEPs and administrators, and 4) LEP parents of pupils with IEPs.
- 6) Remove progress data from the list of vital information recommended to be translated.

Arguments in support. The Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE) writes, “PIQE primarily works with nonnative English-speaking families across the state, working to bridge the gap between those families and their local schools. We have seen firsthand how English learner families can be left behind in their school communities and, conversely, how a simple change like translating important documents can foster a stronger school community and bolster student outcomes.

California is home to 10 million immigrants and, according to the Public Policy Institute of California, 20 percent of California immigrants report that they do not speak English very well and 10 percent report speaking no English. In order to ensure that every parent, guardian, and educational right holder is able to fully understand their child’s IEP, LEAs should be required to provide a translation of the document.

The IEP process has many steps and can be overwhelming and intimidating for any family who is not familiar with the process or terminology, especially if their native language is not English. SB 445 will assist those families toward fully understanding the IEP process.”

Related legislation. SB 695 (Portantino) of the 2019-20 Session would have required LEAs to provide most students’ parents with a translation, upon parental request, of the student’s IEP and other related documents in the native language of the parent within 30 days of the IEP team meeting, and required translations to be conducted by a qualified translator. This bill was vetoed by the Governor, who stated:

Current law already requires that non-English speaking parents and guardians understand their child's IEP, and LEAs must take any action needed to ensure that pupil's non-English speaking parent understands the IEP process and LEAs must also provide any materials used to assess or place a student with exceptional needs in the parent's native language.

By establishing more prescriptive requirements, particularly specifying a 30-day timeline within which those documents must be translated, the bill would exceed the requirements of

federal law (the Individuals with Disabilities Act), thereby creating a costly reimbursable state mandate that will reduce funding available to support broader educational programs for these students.

If a California school district's practices of providing translation services are inadequate, avenues already exist to remedy these problems.

SB 354 (Portantino) of the 2017-18 Session was substantially similar to SB 695. It was vetoed by the Governor, who stated:

I cannot support this bill. Current law requires that non-English speaking parents understand their child's IEP, and in fact gives parents the right to have an interpreter present at their child's IEP meetings. To the extent that this is not sufficient, I think the remedy is best handled at the local school district.

AB 2091 (Lopez) of the 2015-16 Session would have required LEAs to provide parents with a translated copy of an IEP and other specified documents within 60 days, upon request, and required that the IEP and related documents be translated by a qualified translator. This bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1264 (Eduardo Garcia) of the 2017-18 Session would have required that parents be offered copies of any available completed school records related to the pupil's current levels of performance, and any assessment reports, prior to a meeting regarding a student's IEP. This bill was vetoed by the Governor, who stated:

This bill is unnecessary. The Notice of Procedural Safeguards, which is required under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, highlights parents' rights to request copies of relevant school records and reports and receive them within five business days of the request.

This document is provided to parents the first time their child is referred for a special education assessment, when they ask for a copy, each time they are given an assessment plan to evaluate their child, upon receipt of their first state or due process complaint in a school year, and when the decision is made to make a removal that constitutes a change of placement.

As a result, parents who wish to review these records and reports before an Individualized Education Program meeting can already do so.

AB 2785 (O'Donnell), Chapter 579, Statutes of 2016 requires the CDE to develop a manual providing guidance to LEAs on identifying and supporting ELs with disabilities.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

American Alliance of Professional Translators and Interpreters
Association of Regional Center Agencies
Cal-Tash
California Afterschool Network
California Alliance of Child and Family Services

California Association for Parent-child Advocacy
California Charter Schools Association
California Health Coalition Advocacy
California Parents Union
California State PTA
Children Now
City of South Gate
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
Decoding Dyslexia CA
Disability Rights California
Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund
Disability Rights Legal Center
Disability Voices United
East Bay Legislative Coalition
Educate. Advocate.
EdVoice
Family Voices of California
Go Public Schools
Inland Regional Center
Innovate Public Schools
Integrated Community Collaborative
Learning Rights Law Center
National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter
Nourish California
Outschool, Inc.
Pacific Asian Counseling Services
Pacific Juvenile Defender Center
Parent Institute for Quality Education
Parents Helping Parents
Pathpoint
Personal Assistance Services Council
San Francisco Unified School District
Special Needs Network, Inc.
Spina Bifida Association of America
Stand Up California
Support for Families of Children with Disabilities
Teach Plus
United Parents and Students
Vision Y Compromiso
78 individuals

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Tanya Lieberman / ED. / (916) 319-2087